

HENRY C. QUERY, JR.
Patent Attorney At Law

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 09 2005

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET


TO:	FROM:
Examiner Thomas Beach	Henry C. Query, Jr.
COMPANY:	DATE:
USPTO – Group Art Unit 3671	September 9, 2005
FAX NUMBER:	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
571-273-8300	6
SUBJECT:	
U.S. Patent Application No. 10/683,936	
Inventor(s): Bartlett et al.	
Filed: 10/10/2003	
For: FLOW COMPLETION SYSTEM	
Attorney Docket No.: FMCE-P015C	

THIS TRANSMITTAL IS INTENDED FOR DELIVERY ONLY TO THE PERSONS LISTED ABOVE. IT MAY CONTAIN CONFIDENTIAL OR PRIVILEGED INFORMATION, THE DISCLOSURE OF WHICH IS PROHIBITED. IF YOU RECEIVED THIS TRANSMITTAL IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE TO ARRANGE FOR THE RETURN OF THIS DOCUMENT.

Dear Examiner Beach:

Pursuant to our telephone conversation of earlier today, enclosed is a Response to Final Office Action and Telephone Interview Summary.


Sincerely,



Henry C. Query, Jr.

Certificate of Facsimile Transmission Under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence, consisting of 6 total pages, is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on September 9, 2005.



Henry C. Query, Jr.

504 S. Pierce Avenue, Wheaton, IL 60187 Phone: (630) 260-8093 Fax: (630) 260-8076

FMCE-P015C

RECEIVED
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE CENTRAL FAX CENTER

In re Application of: Bartlett et al.)
Serial No.: 10/683,936) Group Art Unit: 3671
Filed: 10/10/2003) Examiner: T. Beach
For: FLOW COMPLETION SYSTEM)

SEP 09 2005

Henry C. Query, Jr.
504 S. Pierce Ave.
Wheaton, IL 60187

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Response to Final Office Action and Telephone Interview Summary

This communication is responsive to the Final Office Action dated July 13, 2005.

The undersigned would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephone interview conducted earlier today. In the telephone interview, the participants primarily discussed the Examiner's interpretation of Baskett et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0011336 A1). A more detailed description of these discussions is set forth below.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 10, 11 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Baskett et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0011336 A1). In particular, the Examiner asserted that element 10 functionally acts as an extension of tubing hanger 4 (07/03/05 Office Action, paragraph 3), and that Baskett therefore shows a flow completion system which comprises a tubing hanger 10 having a production bore

FMCE-P015C

11, first 24 and second 26 closure members within the production bore, and first (unnumbered) and second 30 seals surrounding the tubing hanger 10 (07/03/05 Office Action, paragraph 1).

During the telephone interview, the undersigned argued that element 10 of Baskett cannot be considered to be part of the tubing hanger 4 for the following reasons. First, Baskett identifies element 10 as a crossover assembly (paragraph 59, lines 1-2), while the tubing hanger is identified only by reference number 4 (paragraph 58, lines 1-3). Second, the crossover assembly 10 is installed in the tree 2 (paragraph 59, lines 1-2), while the tubing hanger 4 is installed in the wellhead 6 (paragraph 58, lines 1-3). Third, interposed between the crossover assembly 10 and the tubing hanger 4 are a crossover stab 12 and a sliding valve 16 (Figure 1; paragraph 59, line 4; paragraph 60, lines 7-8). Fourth, the function of the tubing hanger is to support the production tubing 7 (paragraph 58, lines 10-14), while the purpose of the crossover assembly 10 is to allow the tree 2 and the tubing hanger 4 to be retrieved independently of each other (paragraph 10, lines 1-6).

The undersigned also argued that the installation sequence for Baskett's completion system provides further evidence that the crossover assembly 10 does not functionally act as part of the tubing hanger 4. As shown in Figures 3 and 4, the tubing hanger 4 is first installed in the wellhead 6 independent of the crossover assembly 10. Of significance, Figure 4 shows that the tubing hanger 4 is the sole component supporting the production tubing 7 (which is unnumbered in this Figure). Only after the tubing hanger 4 is installed in the wellhead 4 is the

FMCE-P015C

crossover assembly 10 installed. In this regard, Figure 5 shows that the crossover assembly 10 is first installed in the tree 2 and that these two components are then landed as a unit on the wellhead 6.

Thus, the tubing hanger 4 is clearly the only component which supports the tubing string 7. Moreover, since the crossover assembly 10 is supported in the tree 2, this component necessarily does not function to support the tubing string 7. Therefore, the crossover assembly 10 does not functionally act as an extension of the tubing hanger 4.

After discussing these differences between the crossover assembly 10 and the tubing hanger 4, the Examiner indicated that the undersigned's arguments were persuasive. The Examiner thus requested that these arguments be submitted in writing.

Given that the crossover assembly 10 cannot be considered to be part of the tubing hanger 4, Baskett clearly does not anticipate claims 1-3, 10, 11, 16 and 17. For the Examiner's convenience, applicants' arguments regarding the patentability of these claims over Baskett, which were presented in applicants' Amendment of April 27, 2005, are repeated below.

With respect to independent claim 1, Baskett does not disclose a tubing hanger having a production bore in which two closure members are mounted. Rather, Baskett teaches mounting the first and second plugs 24, 26 in the bore of the crossover assembly 10, not the tubing hanger 4.

FMCE-P015C

Therefore, Baskett does not anticipate claim 1. Furthermore, since claims 2, 3 and 10 depend from claim 1, these claims are not anticipated by Baskett for the reasons stated above.

With respect to independent claim 11, Baskett does not disclose first and second pressure containing barriers which are each secured to the body of the tubing hanger and which each isolate both the production bore and the tubing annulus from a portion of the central bore that is located above the tubing hanger. To the contrary, Baskett teaches that the first and second plugs 24, 26 and the first and second seals 38, 40 are secured to the crossover assembly 10. As shown in Figure 4 of Baskett, the tubing hanger 4 appears to have only one plug 68 mounted in its bore 5. Moreover, Baskett does not disclose any specific number of seals between the tubing hanger 4 and the wellhead 6 (see paragraph 58, lines 7-9).

Therefore, Baskett does not anticipate claim 11.

With respect to independent claim 16, Baskett fails to disclose a plug body which is securable in the production bore of the tubing hanger and around which first and second annular seals are positioned. Although Baskett discloses a plug 68 in the production bore 5 of the tubing hanger 4, nowhere does Baskett suggest that this plug supports two annular seals.

Therefore, Baskett does not anticipate claim 16. Furthermore, since claim 17 depends from claim 16, this claim is not anticipated by Baskett for the reasons stated above.

FMCE-P015C

The Examiner has indicated that claims 4-9 and 12-15 would be allowed if they are rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of their base and intervening claims. However, these claims depend from claims 1 and 11, which applicants maintain are patentable. Therefore, applicants submit that claims 4-9 and 12-15 do not need to be rewritten.

In light of the foregoing, claims 1-17 are submitted as allowable.
Favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Henry C. Query, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,650
(630) 260-8093

Date: September 9, 2005